Draft version January 24, 2017
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 5/2/11

arXiv:1701.06465v1 [astro-ph.HE] 23 Jan 2017

LARGE HOST-GALAXY DISPERSION MEASURE OF FAST RADIO BURSTS

Yuan-Pei Yang[1], Rui Luo[1,2], Zhuo Li[1,2] and Bing Zhang[1,2,3]
[1]Kavli Institute for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China; KIAA-CAS Fellow, yypspore@gmail.com; luorui1991@pku.edu.cn; zhuo.li@pku.edu.cn;
[2] Department of Astronomy, School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
[3] Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV 89154, USA; zhang@physics.unlv.edu
Draft version January 24, 2017

ABSTRACT

Fast radio bursts (FRBs) have excessive dispersion measures (DMs) and high Galactic latitudes, which point toward a cosmological origin. We develop a method to extract the mean host galaxy DM ($\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle$) and the characterized isotropic luminosity (L) of FRBs using the observed DM-Flux data. Applying a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method to the data of 18 FRBs, We derive a relative large mean host DM, i.e. $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle \sim 270$ pc cm^{-3} with a large dispersion, and $L \simeq 10^{43}$ erg s^{-1}. A relatively large $\mathrm{DM_{HG}}$ of FRBs is also supported by the millisecond scattering times of some FRBs and the relatively small redshift $z = 0.19273$ of FRB 121102 (which gives $\mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} = 210$ pc cm^{-3}). The large host galaxy DM may be contributed by the ISM or a near-source plasma in the host galaxy. If it is contributed by the ISM, the type of the FRB host galaxies would not be Milky Way (MW)-like, consistent with the detected host of FRB 121102. We also discuss the possibility of having a near-source supernova remnant (SNR), pulsar wind nebula (PWN), or HII region that gives a significant contribution to the observed $\mathrm{DM_{HG}}$.

Subject headings: intergalactic medium — radio continuum: general

1. INTRODUCTION

Fast radio bursts (FRBs) are mysterious astronomical radio transients with short intrinsic durations ($\sim$ 1ms), large dispersion measures (DM $\gtrsim$ 200 pc cm^{-3}), and high Galactic latitudes (Lorimer et al. 2007; Keane et al. 2012; Thornton et al. 2013; Burke-Spolaor & Bannister 2014; Spitler et al. 2014, 2016; Masui et al. 2015; Petroff et al. 2015; Ravi et al. 2015; Champion et al. 2016; Keane et al. 2016; Ravi et al. 2016; Chatterjee et al. 2017). Recently, thanks to the precise localization and multi-wavelength follow-up observations of the repeating source FRB 121102 (Chatterjee et al. 2017; Marcote et al. 2017; Tendulkar et al. 2017), the distance scale of FRBs has been finally settled to the cosmological range. So far, even though only FRB 121102 has a measured redshift $z = 0.19273$ (Tendulkar et al. 2017), the large DM excess of other FRBs with respect to the Galactic value and their high Galactic latitudes suggest that most, if not all, FRBs should have a cosmological origin.

The host galaxies of FRBs carry important information regarding the progenitor of FRBs. For FRB 121102, optical imaging and spectroscopy indicate a dwarf galaxy with a mass of $M \sim (4-7)\times 10^7 M_\odot$ as the host galaxy. The H_α flux of the host galaxy suggests a star formation rate of SFR $\sim 0.4 M_\odot \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ (Tendulkar et al. 2017). No information about the host galaxies of other FRBs is available. One possible way to derive FRB host galaxy information is to extract the host galaxy DM from data. (Yang & Zhang 2016) proposed a method to derive $\mathrm{DM_{HG}}$ using the measured DM and z of a sample of FRBs. However, the z values of most FRBs are not obtained so far.

In this paper, we further develop a method to apply DM and flux of FRBs to infer $\mathrm{DM_{HG}}$. This method is applied to the current FRB sample with 18 sources. Through a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulation, we derive a relatively large mean host galaxy DM, $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle$, for FRBs. We also provide two supporting evidence for a large value of $\mathrm{DM_{HG}}$: millisecond-duration of scattering tails for some FRBs and $\mathrm{DM_{HG}} = 176$ pc cm^{-3} for FRB 121102.

2. METHOD

For an FRB, the observed dispersion measure has three contributions (e.g. Deng & Zhang 2014; Gao et al. 2014; Yang & Zhang 2016), i.e.

$$\mathrm{DM_{obs}} = \mathrm{DM_{MW}} + \mathrm{DM_{HG}} + \mathrm{DM_{IGM}}, \quad (1)$$

which are from the Milk Way, the FRB host galaxy (which itself includes the contributions from the interstellar medium (ISM) in the host galaxy and a near-source plasma), and the IGM, respectively. According to the Galactic pulsar data, $\mathrm{DM_{MW}}$ can be well constrained (Cordes & Lazio 2003), which is a strong function of the Galactic latitude $|b|$, e.g. $\mathrm{DM_{MW}} \lesssim 100$ pc cm^{-3} for $|b| \gtrsim 10^\circ$ and $\mathrm{DM_{MW}} \sim 1000$ pc cm^{-3} for $|b| \sim 0^\circ$. Since $\mathrm{DM_{MW}}$ can be well extracted for a localized FRB, one can define the extragalactic (or excess) dispersion measure of an FRB as

$$\mathrm{DM_E} \equiv \mathrm{DM_{obs}} - \mathrm{DM_{MW}} = \mathrm{DM_{IGM}} + \mathrm{DM_{HG}}, \quad (2)$$

which can be treated as an observed quantity. The properties of FRB host galaxies may be assumed to have no significant evolution with redshift, i.e. $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle \sim$ const, where $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle$ is the average value of the rest-frame host galaxy DM within a certain redshift of distance bin. Due to cosmological time dilation, the observed host DM value reads $\mathrm{DM_{HG}} = \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}/(1+z)$ (Ioka 2003). Considering the local inhomogeneity

of the IGM, we define a mean DM of the IGM as (Deng & Zhang 2014; Yang & Zhang 2016)

$$\langle \mathrm{DM_{IGM}}\rangle = \frac{3cH_0\Omega_b f_{\rm IGM}}{8\pi G m_p}\int_0^z \frac{f_e(z')(1+z')}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z')^3+\Omega_\Lambda}}dz', \\ \simeq \frac{3cH_0\Omega_b f_{\rm IGM} f_e}{8\pi G m_p}\left[z+z^2\left(\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3\Omega_m}{4}\right)+O(z^2)\right], \quad (3)$$

where $f_e(z) = (3/4)y_1\chi_{e,\rm H}(z) + (1/8)y_2\chi_{e,\rm He}(z)$, $y_1 \sim 1$ and $y_2 \simeq 4 - 3y_1 \sim 1$ are the hydrogen and helium mass fractions normalized to 3/4 and 1/4, respectively, and $\chi_{e,\rm H}(z)$ and $\chi_{e,\rm He}(z)$ are the ionization fractions for hydrogen and helium, respectively. For $z < 3$, $\chi_{e,\rm H}(z) \simeq \chi_{e,\rm He}(z) \simeq 1$, due to full ionization of both hydrogen and helium (Meiksin 2009). Therefore, one has $f_e(z) \simeq f_e = 7/8$. We adopt the flat ΛCDM parameters recently derived from the *Plank* data: $H_0 = 67.7$ km s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}, $\Omega_m = 0.31$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.69$, and $\Omega_b = 0.049$ (Planck Collaboration et al. 2015). For the fraction of baryon mass in the intergalactic medium, we adopt $f_{\rm IGM} = 0.83$ (Fukugita et al. 1998; Shull et al. 2012).

For an FRB with an intrinsic frequency-dependent luminosity $L_{\nu_*}(\nu_*)$, the observed flux is given by $F_\nu d\nu = L_{\nu_*}d\nu_*/4\pi d_L^2$. The luminosity distance of the FRB may be given by

$$d_L \simeq \left(\frac{L}{4\pi\nu F_\nu}\right)^{1/2}, \quad (4)$$

where $L \equiv \nu_* L_{\nu_*}$ is the isotropic intrinsic luminosity, and $\nu \simeq 1$ GHz is the characteristic frequency of FRBs[1]. For a flat universe, one has

$$d_L = \frac{c}{H_0}(1+z)\int_0^z \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Omega_m(1+z')^3+\Omega_\Lambda}}dz', \\ \simeq \frac{c}{H_0}\left[z+z^2\left(1-\frac{3\Omega_m}{4}\right)+O(z^2)\right]. \quad (5)$$

For $z \lesssim 1$, according to Eq.(3)-Eq.(5), we can obtain approximately $\mathrm{DM_{IGM}} \simeq A d_L$, where $A \equiv 3H_0^2\Omega_b f_{\rm IGM} f_e/8\pi G m_p$. Therefore, one has the $\mathrm{DM_E}-F_\nu$ relation:

$$\langle \mathrm{DM_E}\rangle \simeq \frac{A}{\sqrt{4\pi}}L^{1/2}\nu^{-1/2}F_\nu^{-1/2} + \langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle. \quad (6)$$

As shown in Eq.(6), $\langle \mathrm{DM_E}\rangle \propto F_\nu^{-1/2}$ for $F_\nu \ll F_{\nu,\rm crit}$, and $\langle \mathrm{DM_E}\rangle \simeq \langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle$ for $F_\nu \gg F_{\nu,\rm crit}$, where $F_{\nu,\rm crit} \equiv A^2 L/4\pi\nu\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle^2$.

One can numerically solve Eq.(3)-Eq.(5), and use the observed $\mathrm{DM_E}-F_\nu$ relation to fit the current sample of 18 FRBs. We take the FRB data from the *FRB Catalogue* of Petroff et al. (2016)[2]. For the repeating FRB, FRB 121102, we take the brightest pulse as its peak flux.

[1] Strictly peaking, a proper k-correction is needed to derive a more rigorous d_L. However, the FRB spectral shape is not well constrained. Since the FRB emission seems to peak around 1 GHz and since the FRB redshift is not very high, our approximate treatment is justified.

[2] http://www.astronomy.swin.edu.au/pulsar/frbcat/

We apply the MCMC method to extract $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle$ from the observed $\mathrm{DM_E}-F_\nu$ relation. The likelihood for the fitting parameters is determined by the χ^2 statistics, i.e.

$$\chi^2(L, \langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle, f) = \sum_i \frac{(\mathrm{DM_{E,}}_i - \langle \mathrm{DM_E}\rangle)^2}{\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{\rm sys}^2(f)}, \quad (7)$$

where i represents the sequence of an FRB in the sample, σ_i represents the error of $\mathrm{DM_{E,i}}$, and $\sigma_{\rm sys} \equiv f\langle \mathrm{DM_E}\rangle$ is the system error, and f is a fitting parameter reflecting the uncertainty of the model. We minimize χ^2 and convert it into a probability density function. We can then obtain the probability distribution of the fitting parameters using the software *emcee*[3].

The analysis results are shown in Figure 1. We have $\log(L/\mathrm{erg\ s^{-1}}) = 42.96^{+0.24}_{-0.55}$, $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle = 267.95^{+215.57}_{-114.69}$ pc cm^{-3} and $\ln f = -0.8^{+0.23}_{-0.19}$. Our results show that FRBs may have a large host galaxy DM, although with large dispersion. On the other hand, the luminosity distribution is quite narrow, which would suggest a possible common origin of the observed FRBs. Interestingly, we note that the fitting intrinsic luminosity $L \sim 10^{43}$ erg s^{-1} is closed to the characteristic luminosity of the magnetar giant flares, e.g. $L_{\rm GF} \simeq 10^{44}$ erg s^{-1}. On the other hand, it is possible that FRBs may have a wide luminosity function, with the fainter ones not detectable with current telescopes.

Our derived relatively large value of $\langle \mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}}\rangle$ is supported by two other independent pieces of evidence.

First, for Galactic pulsars, the scattering time $\tau \ll 10^{-3}$ ms for $|b| \gtrsim 30°$ (e.g. Cordes et al. 2016). However, some FRBs with $|b| > 30°$ have measured scattering time of a few millisecond (Petroff et al. 2016), suggesting that scattering happens outside the Milky Way. The scattering contribution from the IGM is calculated to be negligibly small, so that most the scattering would occur in the FRB host galaxy (Xu & Zhang 2016a). Observations show that a larger scattering tail correspond to a larger DM, e.g. $\hat{\tau} = 2.98\times10^{-7}$ ms $\mathrm{DM}^{1.4}(1 + 3.55\times10^{-5}\mathrm{DM}^{3.1})$ for Galactic pulsars (Cordes et al. 2016), a fact understandable and required by turbulence theories (Xu & Zhang 2016b). If one assumes that the FRBs' hosts have a similar relation, for the millisecond scattering time, one would require $\mathrm{DM_{HG}} \gtrsim 280$ pc cm^{-3}. This is consistent with our derived results.

Second, the host galaxy DM FRB 121102 can be precisely derived. FRB 121102 was localized to a ~ 0.1 arcsecond precision by Chatterjee et al. (2017). The observed dispersion measure is $\mathrm{DM_{obs}} = 558$ pc cm^{-3}. According the location of FRB 121102, Tendulkar et al. (2017) identified an extended source coincident with the burst, which is a host galaxy at $z = 0.19273$. Adopting the *Plank* cosmological parameters and $f_{\rm IGM} = 0.83$, one derive $\mathrm{DM_{IGM}} \simeq 164$ pc cm^{-3}. The MW contribution is $\mathrm{DM_{MW}} \simeq 218$ pc cm^{-3} in the direction (Chatterjee et al. 2017). So one can derive

$$\mathrm{DM_{HG}} = \mathrm{DM_{obs}} - \mathrm{DM_{MW}} - \mathrm{DM_{IGM}} \simeq 176\ \mathrm{pc\ cm^{-3}} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathrm{DM_{HG,loc}} = (1+z)\mathrm{DM_{HG}} \simeq 210\ \mathrm{pc\ cm^{-3}} \quad (9)$$

[3] http://dan.iel.fm/emcee/current.



FIG. 1.— Left: The best fit to the observed $\mathrm{DM_E} - F_\nu$ relation. The blue FRB data points are from the *FRB Catalogue*. The green line denotes the MCMC best fitting curve. Right: Two-dimensional projections of the posterior probability distributions of the model fitting parameters. Data points are shown as grayscale points with contours. Contours are shown at 0.5, 1, 1.5, and 2σ significance levels. The best fitting values are shown on top of each 1D distribution.

for FRB 121102. Such a value is also consistent with our fitting results.

3. DISCUSSION

The above results suggest that the FRB host galaxies have a relatively large value of DM. There could be two possible contributions to such a large DM: the ISM in the host galaxy and the near-source plasma.

For the case of a host ISM, one immediate inference is that the type of the host galaxies of most FRBs would not be MW-like disk galaxies. The reason is that for disk galaxies, FRBs would be most likely emitted from Galactic high latitudes, which gives rise to negligible DM. Indeed, the host galaxy of FRB 121102 was identified as a dwarf galaxy (Tendulkar et al. 2017), which is consistent with our expectation. However, our inferred value is still somewhat larger than the simulated host galaxy DM for various types of galaxies (Xu & Han 2015), suggesting that a near-source plasma may be needed.

For the case of a near-source plasma, we consider the contributions from a SNR, PWN, or HII region. First, in a thin shell approximation, the DM value through a young SNR may be estimated by (see also Katz 2016; Piro 2016; Metzger et al. 2017)

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{DM_{SNR}} &= \frac{M}{4\pi\mu m_p R^2 \Delta R}\Delta R \\ &= 272\ \mathrm{pc\ cm^{-3}}\frac{M}{M_\odot}\left(\frac{R}{0.1\ \mathrm{pc}}\right)^{-2}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where M, R and ΔR are the SNR mass, radius and thickness, respectively, and $\mu = 1.2$ is the mean molecular weight. Note that the SNR dispersion measure does not depend on ΔR of the thin shell. The DM variation of the SNR during an observation time Δt is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\mathrm{DM_{SNR}} &= \frac{M\upsilon}{2\pi\mu m_p R^3}\Delta t \\ &= 16.7\ \mathrm{pc\ cm^{-3}}\frac{M}{M_\odot}\left(\frac{R}{0.1\ \mathrm{pc}}\right)^{-3} \\ &\times\left(\frac{\upsilon}{3000\ \mathrm{km\ s^{-1}}}\right)\left(\frac{\Delta t}{1\ \mathrm{yr}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\upsilon \sim (3000 - 30000)$ km s^{-1} is the characterized SNR velocity. The age of the SNR may be estimated as $T \simeq R/\upsilon \simeq (3 - 30)$ yr$(R/0.1$ pc$)$. In principle, it is possible to expect that the host DM is dominated by a supernova ejecta. However, there are two caveats for this possibility: 1. The thin shell model predicts an observable DM variation over the decade-long time scale, which is inconsistent with the non-variation DM of the repeating FRBs during the approximately four-year period of observations; 2. For an age-independent event rate (the time delay between SN and FRB is uniformly distributed for FRBs), the cumulative distribution of DMs of FRBs should satisfies $N(>\mathrm{DM}) \propto \mathrm{DM}^{-1/2}$ if the observed DM is dominated by the SNRs associated with the FRBs. However, the statistical results of the observed FRBs obviously deviate from this relation (Katz 2016).

Next, we consider the DM contribution from a PWN. Some authors suggested an association of FRBs with young pulsars (Cordes & Wasserman 2016; Connor et al. 2016), while some others suggested an association of FRBs with magnetar giant flares (Popov & Postnov 2010; Kulkarni et al. 2014). While these models are greatly constrained by available observations (Tendulkar et al. 2016; Lyutikov 2017), we nonetheless consider the DM contribution from a pulsar/magnetar wind. The classical Goldreich-Julian number density is

given by (Goldreich & Julian 1969)

$$n_{\rm GJ}(r) = \frac{\Omega B}{2\pi e c} \simeq 7\times10^{12}\ {\rm cm^{-3}} \left(\frac{B_p}{10^{14}\ {\rm G}}\right)\left(\frac{r}{10^{6}\ {\rm cm}}\right)^{-3}\left(\frac{P}{1\ {\rm s}}\right)^{-1}, \quad (12)$$

where B_p is the polar-cap magnetic field strength, and P is the rotation period. A relativistic electron-positron pair plasma is expected to stream out from the magnetosphere. The DM of the pulsar/magnetar wind may be estimated using the pair flux near the light cylinder (e.g. Cao et al. 2017)

$${\rm DM_{PWN}} \simeq 3\Gamma_L \mu_\pm n_{\rm GJ}(R_{\rm LC}) R_{\rm LC} \simeq 124\ {\rm pc\ cm^{-3}} \left(\frac{\mu}{10^6}\right)^{2/3}\left(\frac{B_p}{10^{14}\ {\rm G}}\right)^{4/3} \times \left(\frac{P}{0.3\ {\rm s}}\right)^{-11/3}, \quad (13)$$

where $R_{\rm LC}$ is the radius of the light cylinder, $\mu_\pm$ is multiplicity parameter, $\Gamma_L \sim (L_{\rm sd}/4\pi R_{\rm LC}^2 \mu_\pm n_{\rm GJ}(R_{\rm LC}) m_e c^3)^{1/3}$ is relativistic wind Lorentz factor at the light cylinder, and $L_{\rm sd}$ is the pulsar/magnetar spin-down luminosity. The pulsar/magnetar wind can provide a significant contribution to DM if μ is large enough.

Recently, Zhang (2017) proposed a unified interpretation of FRBs in the so-called "cosmic comb" model, which invokes the interaction between an astrophysical plasma stream and a foreground regular pulsar. Since cosmic combs more easily happen in slow ($P \sim 1$ s) and low-field ($B \sim 10^{12}$ G) pulsars, the DM contribution from the near-source plasma is ${\rm DM_{PWN}} \sim 0.003$ pc cm^{-3}. Therefore, in the cosmic comb model, the large host galaxy DM might result from the host galaxy ISM or the near-source plasma of the stream source in front of the pulsar towards Earth.

At last, we consider the DM contribution from a HII region in the host galaxy, assuming that an FRB is embedded in a Strömgren sphere. The DM contributed by a Strömgren sphere may be estimated as

$${\rm DM_{HII}} = nR_s = \left(\frac{3N_u n}{4\pi\alpha}\right)^{1/3} = 540\ {\rm pc\ cm^{-3}} \left(\frac{N_u}{5\times10^{49}\ {\rm s^{-1}}}\right)^{1/3}\left(\frac{n}{100\ {\rm cm^{-3}}}\right)^{1/3}, \quad (14)$$

where n is the gas number density in the HII region, N_u is the rate of ionizing photons from a star, α is the recombination rate, and $R_s \equiv \left(3N_u/4\pi\alpha n^2\right)^{1/3}$ is the Strömgren radius. We assume that the there is an O5 star in HII region, so that $\alpha = 2.6\times10^{-13}$ cm^{3}s^{-1} for $T = 10^4$ K, and the Strömgren radius is $R_s = 5.4$ pc. We note that the Strömgren radius is much larger than the projected size of $\lesssim 0.7$ pc of FRB 121102 radio persistent emission source (Marcote et al. 2017).

In summary, we show that the current FRB observations imply large host galaxy DM values, e.g., $\langle {\rm DM_{HG,loc}} \rangle \gtrsim 200$ pc cm^{-3}. Such a large DM may be contributed by the host ISM or a near-source plasma. Such a result poses requirements to FRB progenitor models.

In the total host galaxy DM, the contribution from the near-source plasma also plays an essential role to identify the progenitor systems of FRBs. The various models have a wide DM distribution. For models invoking young energetic pulsars and magnetars (e.g. Connor et al. 2016; Cordes & Wasserman 2016; Yang et al. 2016; Piro 2016; Murase et al. 2016a,b; Metzger et al. 2017; Kashiyama & Murase 2017) or collapse of new-born supra-massive neutron star (e.g. Falcke & Rezzolla 2014; Zhang 2014), a near-source SNR or PWN may give an important contribution to the observed DM. Also irregular star-forming galaxies (e.g. the host galaxy of FRB 121102) do not have a disk-like structure, and may provide a relatively large host DM. For the models invoking compact object mergers (e.g. Totani 2013; Zhang 2016; Wang et al. 2016), the contribution from a near-source plasma may not be important. These systems may also have a large offset from the host galaxy. However, elliptical or early-type host galaxies that harbor these events may also provide large free electron column needed to account for the large ${\rm DM_{HG}}$ inferred from the data.

We thank Zi-Gao Dai, Yan Huang, Tian-Qi Huang and Su Yao for helpful discussions. This work is partially supported by the Initiative Postdocs Supporting Program (No. BX201600003), the National Basic Research Program (973 Program) of China (No. 2014CB845800), the National Natural Science Found (No.11273005) and Project funded by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (No. 2016M600851). Yuan-Pei Yang is supported by a KIAA-CAS Fellowship.

REFERENCES

Burke-Spolaor, S., & Bannister, K. W. 2014, ApJ, 792, 19
Cao, X.-F., Yu, Y.-W., & Dai, Z.-G. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.05482
Champion, D. J., Petroff, E., Kramer, M., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 460, L30
Chatterjee, S., Law, C. J., Wharton, R. S., et al. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.01098
Connor, L., Sievers, J., & Pen, U.-L. 2016, MNRAS, 458, L19
Cordes, J. M., & Lazio, T. J. W. 2003, ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints, astro-ph/0301598
Cordes, J. M., & Wasserman, I. 2016, MNRAS, 457, 232
Cordes, J. M., Wharton, R. S., Spitler, L. G., Chatterjee, S., & Wasserman, I. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1605.05890
Deng, W., & Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, 783, L35
Falcke, H., & Rezzolla, L. 2014, A&A, 562, A137
Fukugita, M., Hogan, C. J., & Peebles, P. J. E. 1998, ApJ, 503, 518
Gao, H., Li, Z., & Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, 788, 189
Goldreich, P., & Julian, W. H. 1969, ApJ, 157, 869
Ioka, K. 2003, ApJ, 598, L79
Kashiyama, K., & Murase, K. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.04815

Katz, J. I. 2016, ApJ, 818, 19
Keane, E. F., Stappers, B. W., Kramer, M., & Lyne, A. G. 2012, MNRAS, 425, L71
Keane, E. F., Johnston, S., Bhandari, S., et al. 2016, Nature, 530, 453
Kulkarni, S. R., Ofek, E. O., Neill, J. D., Zheng, Z., & Juric, M. 2014, ApJ, 797, 70
Lorimer, D. R., Bailes, M., McLaughlin, M. A., Narkevic, D. J., & Crawford, F. 2007, Science, 318, 777
Lyutikov, M. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.02003
Marcote, B., Paragi, Z., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2017, ApJ, 834, L8
Masui, K., Lin, H.-H., Sievers, J., et al. 2015, Nature, 528, 523
Meiksin, A. A. 2009, Reviews of Modern Physics, 81, 1405
Metzger, B. D., Berger, E., & Margalit, B. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.02370
Murase, K., Kashiyama, K., & Mészáros, P. 2016a, MNRAS, 461, 1498
Murase, K., Meszaros, P., & Fox, D. B. 2016b, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1611.03848
Petroff, E., Bailes, M., Barr, E. D., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 447, 246
Petroff, E., Barr, E. D., Jameson, A., et al. 2016, PASA, 33, e045
Piro, A. L. 2016, ApJ, 824, L32
Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2015, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1502.01589
Popov, S. B., & Postnov, K. A. 2010, in Evolution of Cosmic Objects through their Physical Activity, ed. H. A. Harutyunian, A. M. Mickaelian, & Y. Terzian, 129–132
Ravi, V., Shannon, R. M., & Jameson, A. 2015, ApJ, 799, L5
Ravi, V., Shannon, R. M., Bailes, M., et al. 2016, Science, 354, 1249
Shull, J. M., Smith, B. D., & Danforth, C. W. 2012, ApJ, 759, 23
Spitler, L. G., Cordes, J. M., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2014, ApJ, 790, 101
Spitler, L. G., Scholz, P., Hessels, J. W. T., et al. 2016, Nature, 531, 202
Tendulkar, S. P., Kaspi, V. M., & Patel, C. 2016, ApJ, 827, 59
Tendulkar, S. P., Bassa, C. G., Cordes, J. M., et al. 2017, ApJ, 834, L7
Thornton, D., Stappers, B., Bailes, M., et al. 2013, Science, 341, 53
Totani, T. 2013, PASJ, 65, L12
Wang, J.-S., Yang, Y.-P., Wu, X.-F., Dai, Z.-G., & Wang, F.-Y. 2016, ApJ, 822, L7
Xu, J., & Han, J. L. 2015, Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 15, 1629
Xu, S., & Zhang, B. 2016a, ApJ, 832, 199
—. 2016b, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1610.03011
Yang, Y.-P., & Zhang, B. 2016, ApJ, 830, L31
Yang, Y.-P., Zhang, B., & Dai, Z.-G. 2016, ApJ, 819, L12
Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, 780, L21
—. 2016, ApJ, 827, L31
—. 2017, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1701.04094